

California High-Speed Rail Authority
**Responses to Written Questions on RFQs HSR06-0006,
HSR06-0007, & the re-submittal of HSR06-0005:**

Q1. We were wondering whether you plan to move (apply) the "old" set of questions and answers to this new procurement, or should we re-submit our questions? In other words, will all of your decisions and clarifications (e.g., regarding page counts, etc.) from before still apply now?

A1. The questions and answers for RFQ HSR06-0003, HSR06-0004, and HSR06-0005 are attached as part of this document (see below). The decisions and clarifications from before have not changed.

Q2. We assume that the "modifications" to the RFQ for the earlier round of submittals would also apply to the second round, but just to be sure:

- A. Does the page limit exclude the subconsultant transmittal letters?
- B. Does the page limit exclude the requested Financial Responsibility information?
- C. Are 11x17 pages permitted?

A2. See A1.

Q3. On page 2, the RFQ states that "a list of five references (for each firm)" is required in the response. Does the Authority need five references from the prime and five from each subconsultant?

A3. Yes.

Q4. The numbering of the sections of the RFQ indicate that some sections are possibly missing between sections VI. (Miscellaneous) and IX. (General Contract Process Information). Are there sections VII or VIII to be included in the RFQ?

A4. It appears you have an initial draft of the RFQ. Please see the Final RFQ posted on the Authority website (www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov). There are no missing sections in the final RFQ.

Q5. Is a draft of the agreement the Consultant will be asked to sign available for review prior to the due date for the SOQ?

A5. No.

The following responses prepared to Written Questions on RFQs HSR06-0003, HSR06-0004, & HSR06-0005 also apply to RFQs HSR06-0006, HSR06-007 and the re-submittal of HSR06-0005:

Q1. I would like to submit a formal question regarding the above referenced RFQ. Due to no pre-proposal meeting, will your agency release the list of interested firms pursuing the Engineering Work RFQ's?

A1. Lists of those that requested the RFQs from the State Contracts Register as of November 22, 2006 are provided as an attachment. Please note however, these lists do not include those that downloaded the RFQs from the Authority's website, contacted the Authority staff directly, or took hard copies at CHSRA board meetings.

Q2. On page 2 of 26 of the RFQ, II, Submission of SOQ, you direct us to submit a subconsultant transmittal letter from each of our subconsultants. We may have over 10 subconsultants on our team. Will each letter be counted toward the 60-page limit?

A2. No. We will not count the subconsultant transmittal letters toward the 60-page limit.

Q3. Will this project, HSR06-0005 include the financial analysis component, or will this component be covered under the Financing Plan RFP, which is identified on your website as "process complete"?

A3. This contract will not have a Financial Analysis Component. This will be covered under a separate contract.

Q4. I am concerned about the 3% participation requirement against the small universe of DVBE firms, especially when applied to a project with many highly specialized requirements and a potential budget in the tens of millions of dollars over the course of time needed to complete the Draft and Final Environmental documents and accompanying engineering. Might the Authority reconsider this requirement against a capped dollar amount? Or, to also include other categories of disadvantaged businesses in meeting the goal?

A4. There is no "requirement" for DVBE participation. These RFQs are qualifications based and the Authority cannot require that goals be met for DVBE participation. As stated in the RFQs, the DVBE "participation goal" is 3%. In addition, the RFQs also state that the Authority is also committed to supporting Small Business Enterprise (SBE) participation and while there are no MBE/WBE goals established, the RFQs recognizes California's diverse mixture of cultures and interests and

notes that the proposers need to be sensitive towards reaching and including these populations when developing their teams.

Q5. I'm principal of a small professional services firm that provides *historical research, analysis, and interpretation* for EIRs and other public projects. Having just reviewed your solicitation documents briefly online, it appears that an independent bid on our part would not be feasible.

Is there any relatively straightforward way for us to connect with primes or multiservice archaeological/cultural resources firms? For example, are you maintaining a list of companies that have expressed an interest in partnering? (I know the rules are changing, but we're a Metro-certified DBE and WBE).

A5. See A1 and A4 above.

Q6. I was hoping I could obtain a copy of the list of RFQ holders for the three RFQs for the preliminary design & project specific environmental RFQ for the trains from Fresno to Orange County. Please let me know if this would be at all possible.

A6. See A1 above.

Q7. Can you elaborate on what is required in the "Financial Responsibility" section?

A7. Firms proposing on the RFQs are required to carry professional liability insurance and should provide evidence of at least \$5 million in professional liability insurance. Firms should also provide a copy of their certified overhead statement and present their last couple years of certified financial statements.

Q8. With regard to the 60 page limit:

- a. Can we exclude letters of transmittal from subcontractors and the DVBE standard form 840?
- b. We plan to have tab dividers between sections. Can we assume that these will not count as "pages"?
- c. Can we include a limited number of 11 x 17 sheets for figures and have these count as single pages?

A8. The answer to each of these questions (a., b. and c.) is "yes".

Q9. Can you provide the cost proposal requirements in advance of the shortlist announcement (Section VII.A.9 of the RFQ)? Given the proximity of the shortlist announcement and interview with the Thanksgiving holiday, we

would appreciate as much lead time as possible to prepare our cost estimate in your desired format.

A9. Yes. Please see the “Cost Proposal Requirements” attachment.

Q10. I would like to inquire about whether you have a list of the engineering firms that are bidding on the CA High Speed Rail Authority RFQ’s for the Environmental/Engineering Work. We are a woman-owned business and are very interested in being a sub-consultant. I look forward to your reply.

A10. See A1 and A4 above.

Q12. Would CHSRA consider splitting up the work for engineering services and environmental to give broader opportunities to more business owners to participate in this contracting process; rather than having one firm (typically) manage both aspects of the work?

A12. We considered many approaches, but determined that the one outlined in the RFQs was the best for carrying out this work. Please also see A4 above.

Q13. Also, doesn't EXECUTIVE ORDER S-02-06 apply with these STATE contracting opportunities. If so, why isn't there a goal of 25 percent required for small business participation?

A13. These RFQs are qualifications based and the Authority cannot require that goals be met for small business participation. However, the Authority is committed to supporting Small Business Enterprise participation in state contracting and seeks to use SBEs wherever possible. Please see “Small Business Enterprise Participation” (pg 14) of the RFQs.

Q14. Please clarify that while the HST engineering design criteria for train systems is being provided by the PMC, the engineering design of the train systems and their integration into the civil and track design, will be the responsibility of the selected Environmental/Preliminary Engineering Firm.

A14. While the HST engineering design criteria for train systems is being provided by the PMC, the site-specific (such as location of electrification substations) engineering design of the train systems and their integration into the civil and track design, will be the responsibility of the selected Environmental/Preliminary Engineering Firm.

Q15. Can the SF840, DVBE Certifications and subconsultant transmittal letters be excluded from the maximum 60 page count?

A15. Yes.

Q16. Are we permitted to submit oversized (larger than 11X17) pages? Will they count as one page?

A16. Yes.

Q17. Page 2 of the SOQ limits the total number of pages for the RFQ to 60 and also requires a one page transmittal letter from each subconsultant. Due to the potential number of subconsultants to complete specialty studies and to address the stated desire to include SBE and MBE/WBE firms including these letters in the overall page count could reduce our ability to effectively communicate our project approach and qualifications. Can the one page subconsultant transmittal letters be excluded from the 60 page limitation?

A17. Yes.

Q18. Page 10 of the SOQ identifies design concepts that the FIRM will be responsible for developing including "Electric Traction Facilities and Catenary" yet the second paragraph on the page calls for the PM to supply train systems (signaling, communications and electrification) engineering. Would you clarify which entity will be responsible or if it is intended to be a collaborative effort?

A18. The PM will be responsible for system-level design of Electric Traction Facilities and Catenary. Whereas, the Regional Environmental/Engineering FIRMs will be responsible for any site-specific design of Electric Traction Facilities and Catenary within their regions (such as the location of substations) based on requirements/criteria established by the PM.

Q19. Page 11 of the SOQ, when it says "The FIRM will provide a scope of work for each technical study and impact topic required by CEQA and NEPA," does that mean the scopes are to be included in the SOQ? Again detailed scopes of work for 20 or more technical topics for the environmental studies alone could take up the majority of the 60 pages. Alternatively, should the SOQ address our overall approach to the environmental studies and highlight our understanding of the key issues and our approach to addressing the issues?

A19. The SOQ shall include a proposed approach, and the FIRM will provide a brief scope of work for each technical study and impact topic required by CEQA and NEPA. As noted in the RFQ, FIRMs are to provide a brief description of the proposed work program to perform the work defined in the "Scope of Work".

Q20. What level of detail in the engineering analysis is expected by the Authority for the HSR noise and vibration projections for the Regional EIR/EIS studies?

A20. A project-level of detail is required for these project-level environmental studies.

Q21. What level of measurement and documentation of existing noise and vibration conditions are expected by the Authority, and in particular field measurements and/or analytical modeling of soil vibration characteristics for corridors with widely varying geologic conditions?

A21. See A20 above.

Q22. How important is it that the noise and vibration consultant have adequate experience with rail projects, specifically HSR technology and the FRA procedures and methodology, and possess the technical expertise, analytical skill set, and field measurement capability to deal with these complex issues?

A22. It is important that the noise and vibration consultant have the experience necessary to carry out these project-level studies.

Q23. How important or valuable to the Project is access to the latest noise and vibration data for potential CHSR vehicle technology and track design?

A23. Access to the latest noise and vibration data for potential HST technology and track design is important for the Regional Environmental/Engineering Work, however, we cannot quantify “how important or valuable” this is.

Q24. Please clarify if the subconsultant transmittal letters (max 1 page each) are included or excluded from the 60 page limit. If they are included, please indicate whether half-size copies (ie. two letters per page) would be acceptable to the Authority.

A24. Subconsultant transmittal letters are excluded from the 60 page limit.

Q25. Please clarify if the detailed Work Plan requested in the bold-face paragraph on page 6 is included or excluded from the 60 page limit.

A25. Firms are to provide a “brief” description of the proposed work program to perform the work defined in the “Scope of Work” as part of the 60 page limit (see page 2 of the RFQs). This includes the “work

plan” Firms must submit as part of these RFQs. A detailed Work Plan is not requested in response to these RFQs.

Q26. I have just learned that our corporate financial statement runs to 10 pages, including the footnotes (which must be included). Thus, the total page count for the "Financial Responsibility" section alone comes to 13 pages (including the certificate of insurance and statement of overhead rate), and we must provide the similar information for the three principal firms on our team.

I apologize, in that I realize we should have clarified this point earlier, but must ask whether we can also exclude the "Financial Responsibility" section from the 60-page limit.

A26. We will not count the “Financial Responsibility” section as part of the 60-page limit for the reasons you have described.

Q27. I am putting together a submittal for the aforementioned RFQ number and would like to know if you would send me the Word or Excel files for the Standard Form 840, or perhaps you could give me the link to where they reside on the CA HSR website.

A27. Please see the attachment for Standard Form 840.